UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/773,109	01/31/2001	Fabrice C. Hamaide	4270/010094	5461

23441 7590 10/20/2004

LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL DRYJA
704 228TH AVENUE NE
PMB 694
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/773,109	HAMAIDE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joshua D Campbell	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 06/25/2004.

2. Claims 1-18 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 17 and 18 are independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 10-12, 17, and 18 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-15, and 17-18 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cramer et al. (hereinafter Cramer, US Patent Application Publication 2002/0104096, US filing date July 19, 2000).

5. If a copy of a provisional application listed on the bottom portion of the accompanying Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) form is not included with this Office action and the PTO-892 has been annotated to indicate that the copy was not readily available, it is because the copy could not be readily obtained when the Office action was mailed. Should applicant desire a copy of such a provisional application, applicant should promptly request the copy from the Office of Public Records (OPR) in

accordance with 37 CFR 1.14(a)(1)(iv), paying the required fee under 37 CFR 1.19(b)(1). If a copy is ordered from OPR, the shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action will not be reset under MPEP § 710.06 unless applicant can demonstrate a substantial delay by the Office in fulfilling the order for the copy of the provisional application. Where the applicant has been notified on the PTO-892 that a copy of the provisional application is not readily available, the provision of MPEP § 707.05(a) that a copy of the cited reference will be automatically furnished without charge does not apply.

Regarding independent claim 1, Cramer discloses a method in which the occurrence of an event is detected and based on that detection a multimedia presentation is initiated on the web page that the event occurred on (page 1, paragraphs 0003-0007 of Cramer). The multimedia presentation is displayed within the same window as the web page that initiated it is being displayed (page 1, paragraph 0003 of Cramer).

Regarding independent claim 2, Cramer discloses a method in which the occurrence of an event is detected and based on that detection multimedia events are triggered based on the event that occurred (page 1, paragraphs 0003-0007 of Cramer). Cramer also discloses that the content and the multimedia player plug-in are loaded and the content is played in response to the event (page 3, paragraphs 0040-0044 of Cramer). Cramer discloses that the event (when all the static content is loaded) is a

non-user-initiated event (page 3, paragraphs 0040-0044 and page 5, paragraphs 0079-0086 of Cramer).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Cramer discloses a method in which the multimedia presentation is not loaded until the page loading is fully completed at which point the applet (JavaScript) loads the necessary multimedia player (page 3, paragraphs 0040-0044 and page 5, paragraphs 0079-0086 of Cramer).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Cramer discloses a method in which the multimedia player is loaded in an HTML layer that contains the necessary tags to load and run the player (page 1, paragraphs 0003-0007 and page 4, paragraph 0069-page 5, paragraph 0070 of Cramer).

Regarding dependent claims 7 and 9, Cramer discloses in which different method of loading and launching the multimedia player are established for different web browsers (either Internet Explorer of Netscape) and different methods are established for different environments (either Windows or Mac OS) (page 3, paragraphs 0039-0047).

Regarding independent claims 10 and 11, Cramer discloses a method in which the multimedia presentation is not loaded until the page loading is fully completed at which point the applet (JavaScript) loads the necessary multimedia player (page 3, paragraphs 0040-0044 and page 5, paragraphs 0079-0086 of Cramer). Cramer also discloses that the content is loaded and the content is played on the player in the web page (page 3, paragraphs 0040-0044 of Cramer). The multimedia presentation is

displayed within the same window as the web page that initiated it is being displayed (page 1, paragraph 0003 of Cramer).

Regarding independent claims 12 and 17, Cramer discloses a method in which the multimedia presentation is not loaded until the page loading is fully completed at which point the applet (JavaScript) loads the necessary multimedia player (page 3, paragraphs 0040-0044 and page 5, paragraphs 0079-0086 of Cramer). Cramer also discloses that the web page contains user selectable images that are clicked on by the user to initiate different presentations (page 1, paragraphs 0003-0007 of Cramer). The multimedia presentation is displayed within the same window as the web page that initiated it is being displayed (page 1, paragraph 0003 of Cramer).

Regarding dependent claims 13-15, Cramer discloses a method in which buttons, links, and selections from a menu screen are all methods of selections (page 1, paragraph 0003-0007 and page 3, paragraph 0051-page 4, paragraph 0054 of Cramer).

Regarding independent claim 18, Cramer discloses a method in which the multimedia presentation is not loaded until the page loading is fully completed at which point the applet (JavaScript) loads the necessary multimedia player (page 3, paragraphs 0040-0044 and page 5, paragraphs 0079-0086 of Cramer). Cramer also discloses that the web page contains user selectable images that are clicked on by the user to initiate different presentations, which include both audio and video presentations (page 1, paragraphs 0003-0007 and (page 1, paragraphs 0003-0007 and pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033 of Cramer). The presentation, audio or video, that corresponds to the image is then initiated and played (page 1, paragraphs 0003-0007 and pages 2-3,

paragraphs 0030-0033 of Cramer). The multimedia presentation is displayed within the same window as the web page that initiated it is being displayed (page 1, paragraph 0003 of Cramer).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cramer et al. (hereinafter Cramer, US Patent Application Publication 2002/0104096, US filing date July 19, 2000).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Cramer does not disclose that the completion of loading is determined by the occurrence of the JavaScript onLoad command. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the onLoad command with the method of Cramer because the onLoad command was a well know script command used to cause a script to run once web page was fully loaded.

9. Claims 6 and 8 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cramer et al. (hereinafter Cramer, US Patent Application Publication 2002/0104096, US filing date July 19, 2000) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Leduc (US Patent Number 6,639,611, filed on December 15, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Cramer discloses a method in which tags are embedded into the web page that necessary to initiate the multimedia player and presentation whenever the browser is Internet Explorer (page 5, paragraphs 0078-0086). Cramer does not disclose that the contents are in an HTML table cell. However, Leduc discloses that web pages commonly contain HTML tables in which the cells contain content of the web page (column 1, line 12-column 2, line 45 of Leduc). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method of HTML table layout of Leduc with the method of Cramer because it would have allowed the web page to be constructed in a more organized in layout.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Cramer discloses a method in which the multimedia player is loaded in an HTML layer that contains the necessary tags to load and run the player when the web browser is Netscape (page 1, paragraphs 0003-0007, page 4, paragraph 0069-page 5, paragraph 0070, and page 5, paragraphs 0078-0086). Cramer discloses a method in which tags are embedded into the web page that necessary to initiate the multimedia player and presentation whenever the browser is Internet Explorer (page 5, paragraphs 0078-0086). Cramer does not disclose that the contents are in an HTML table cell. However, Leduc discloses that web pages commonly contain HTML tables in which the cells contain content of the web page (column 1, line 12-column 2, line 45 of Leduc). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the method of HTML table layout of Leduc with the method of Cramer because it would have allowed the web page to be constructed in a more organized in layout

10. Claim 16 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cramer et al. (hereinafter Cramer, US Patent Application Publication 2002/0104096, US filing date July 19, 2000) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Lui et al. (hereinafter Lui, US Patent Number 6,340,977, filed on May 7, 1999).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Cramer does not disclose a method in which the user selectable image is a search box and the multimedia presentation provides tips and hints. However, Lui discloses a method in which a user interacts with interface search tools, which would include a search box (Abstract of Lui). When the user

interacts with the box a multimedia presentation in the form of a dynamic assistant is presented to the user to provide tips and hints (Abstract of Lui). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the method of Cramer with the assistance method of Lui because it would have provided the user with easy access to helpful multimedia presentations.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 12, 17, and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Due to the amendment it was necessary to add clarification to the original rejection, which shows that Cramer discloses the limitation that the presentation occurs in the same open window as the web page.

12. Applicant's arguments filed 06/25/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the arguments in reference to claims 3, 10, and 11 referring to the limitation detecting that a page has finished loading, the examiner has considered the arguments which are now deemed as unpersuasive. As stated by the applicant, using DHTML automatically starts to load the animation when the page has finished loading. Based on this statement alone it is inherent that the disclosure of Cramer detects whether the page has finished or not in order to properly operate.

Regarding the arguments in reference to claim 3 referring to the limitation using an applet to select and load the media player, the examiner has considered the

arguments which are now deemed as unpersuasive. Cramer does use DHTML, which like JavaScript is a language used for creating and running applets in web pages.

Regarding the arguments in reference to claim 5 referring to the limitation selecting and loading the media player, the examiner has considered the arguments which are now deemed as unpersuasive. As is true with all graphical user interfaces, the player is not considered to be loaded to the display until it is visible on the display, which as disclosed by Cramer requires selection by the program.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JDC
October 14, 2004

STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER